

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 20 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter; rejected claims 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2002/0143805 to Hayes et al. ("Hayes"); rejected claims 1-3, 6-8 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes; and rejected claims 5, and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Japanese Patent No. JP 09-023487 to Hideyuki ("Hideyuki").

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 5-19, and 21-24 will remain pending and under current examination. Applicant amends claims 1-3, 5-19, and 21-24, and cancels claims 4, 20, and 25.

Applicant cancels claims 20 and 25, rendering the Examiner's rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101 moot.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes. Hayes does not disclose or suggest each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention.

Independent claim 1, for example, recites a control apparatus controlling an information processing apparatus, including:

first acquisition means for acquiring operation screen information of a plurality of information processing apparatuses when the plurality of information processing apparatuses are detected, each operation screen

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

information including a full display for controlling the corresponding information processing apparatus; . . .

editing means for editing the operation screen information to display operation screen information for a plurality of information processing apparatuses in a single display region

(emphasis added). The Examiner concedes that Hayes “does not explicitly disclose an editing means for editing said plurality of operation screen information so that said plurality of operation screens are displayed in a single display region . . .” Office Action at 5. A proper rejection under § 103(a) requires that the references, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element required by the claims. Because the Examiner concedes that Hayes fails to disclose the claimed “editing means,” and no other reference is provided to cure this deficiency, the Examiner’s rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner attempts to cure this deficiency by alleging: “However, Hayes does disclose the ability to move functions from one display screen to another display screen . . . [t]herefore it would have been obvious . . . that the screen information could be displayed in a single display region.” Id. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Hayes to arrive at Applicant’s claimed invention.

Hayes’s disclosure of moving a single function or key, such as moving “the channel up function for the TV device such that it is accessible from the VCR device screen” (Hayes, paragraph 0123a), does not suggest editing a plurality of “full displays” to fit on a “single display,” as recited by claim 1. Hayes’s disclosure of moving a single key, if anything, teaches away from the claimed invention. Moving a single key that is used to control one device onto a control screen for another device is likely to confuse a

user as to which device the key controls. Also, Hayes's disclosure of displaying only a single control screen for one device is also confusing to a user who may not be able to determine how to locate all of the controls for another device. In contrast, Applicant's claimed invention overcomes these problems by displaying multiple operation screens that control multiple information processing apparatuses within a single display region.

Because the Examiner concedes that Hayes does not teach or suggest each and every element recited by claim 1, and because one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified Hayes to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established for claim 1. Claims 18 and 19, although of different scope than claim 1, patentably distinguish from Hayes for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2, 3, 6-8, and 15-17 depend from claim 1 and therefore require all of the elements recited therein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes.²

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 5 and 9-14 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Hideyuki. Claims 5 and 9-14 depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the elements recited therein. As discussed above, Hayes fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited by claim 1 and required by claims 5 and 9-14. Hideyuki fails to cure the deficiencies of Hayes, nor does the Examiner rely on Hideyuki for such teachings. Accordingly, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established for claims 5 and 9-14. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner

reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 5 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Hideyuki.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 21-24³ under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hayes. Independent claims 21- 24, although of different scope than claim 1, patentably distinguish from Hayes for at least the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 21-24 under § 102(e).


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 9, 2007

By: 
Nathan A. Sloan
Reg. No. 56,249
202.408.4312

² Applicant cancels claim 20, rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

³ Applicant cancels claim 25, rendering the Examiner's rejection of this claim moot.